

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In complete response to the Office Action dated March 28, 2011, on the above identified application, reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 15-18 are pending in this application.

In the Drawings

The drawings are objected to for failing to show every feature in the invention specified in the claims. Claims 11 – 14, and 19 have been cancelled, thereby rendering this objection moot.

In the Specification

Section headings have also been added to the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

Claims 11 and 14 stand objected to because of informalities. These claims have been cancelled, thereby rendering these objections moot.

Claim 20 has been objected to due to multiple dependencies. This claim has been cancelled, thereby rendering this objection moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the application regards as the invention. Claim 13 has been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 11 - 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianchi et al '482 in view of Hill et al. '778. Claims 11 – 14 have been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 15 - 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianchi et al '482 in view of Hill et al. '778, and further in view

of Halimi et al. '208. Applicants submit that claims 15 – 19 are not unpatentable over Bianchi et al '482 in view of Hill et al. '778, and further in view of Halimi et al. '208.

The Examiner notes that Bianchi et al. '482 discloses compressors that are driven by turbines, and does not disclose the use of an electric motor with variable speeds and windings. Hill et al. '778 is introduced to remedy this deficiency. The present invention, as well as that disclosed in Bianchi et al. '482 pertains to air separation by means of rectification columns. Hill et al. '778 pertains to a method for purifying a fluid by using a molecular sieve. One skilled in the art would not consider combining the teachings of such disparate art. Halimi et al. '208 is even more disparate, as it pertains to the turbocharging of internal combustion engines. Applicants respectfully submit that these three references are not compatible, and the skilled artisan would find no reason to combine them.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 24, 2011**

Elwood Haynes/
Elwood Haynes, Reg. No. 55,254

Air Liquide US LLC
2700 Post Oak Blvd., 18th Floor
Houston, TX 77056
Phone: 713-624-8954
Fax: 713-624-8950